

## Remarks

Claims 3-14 and 17-22 are now pending in this application. Applicants have amended claims 3-14 and 17-20, presented new claims 21 and 22, and cancelled claims 1, 2, 15 and 16 to clarify the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this application.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite. Applicants have rewritten claims 1 and 15 as new claims 21 and 22 and amended claims 3-14 and 17-20 to clarify the claimed invention. Applicants submit that all pending claims comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph and respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 3 and 4 no longer recite the language objected to by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this objection.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-6 and 11-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. patent 3,777,618 to Iwai et al. The Examiner rejected claims 1, 5, 6, and 11-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese patent JP 01-210289. The Examiner rejected claims 7-10 and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwai et al. in view of U.S. patent 2,840,651 to Weglarz.

Neither Iwai et al. nor JP 01-210289 discloses the invention recited in claims 21 or 22

since, among other things, neither Iwai et al. nor JP 01-210289 discloses a device that includes a plurality of stop elements arranged adjacent to each other on the first robot part, each stop element including mutually engaging connecting members configured to mechanically interlock adjacent stop elements and transmit forces between adjacent stop elements when the stop elements engage fixed stops on two parts extending from and rotating about a common axis of rotation, such that the individual stop elements essentially behave as a single coherent stop element. Iwai et al. appears to disclose a structure that includes an arm that rotates about its longitudinal axis rather than two robot parts that extend from and rotate about a common axis. Neither Iwai et al. nor JP 01-210289 suggests multiple mechanically interconnected stop elements.

In view of the above, neither Iwai et al. nor JP 01-210289 discloses all elements of the invention recited in claims 2-6 and 11-14, 16, 20 or 21. Since neither Iwai et al. nor JP 01-210289 discloses all elements of the invention recited in claims 2-6 and 11-14, 16, 20 or 21, the invention recited in claims 2-6 and 11-14, 16, 20 or 21 is not properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). For an anticipation rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) no difference may exist between the claimed invention and the reference disclosure. *See Scripps Clinic and Research Foundation v. Genentech, Inc.*, 18 U.S.P.Q. 841 (C.A.F.C. 1984).

Along these lines, anticipation requires the disclosure, in a cited reference, of each and every recitation, as set forth in the claims. *See Hodosh v. Block Drug Co.*, 229 U.S.P.Q. 182 (Fed. Cir. 1986); *Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner*, 227 U.S.P.Q. 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *Orthokinetics, Inc. v. Safety Travel Chairs, Inc.*, 1 U.S.P.Q.2d 1081 (Fed. Cir. 1986); and *Akzo N.V. v. U.S. International*

The combination of Iwai et al. and Weglarz does not disclose the invention recited in claims 7-10 and 17-20 since, among other things, the combination does not suggest a device that includes a plurality of stop elements arranged adjacent to each other on the first robot part, each stop element including mutually engaging connecting members configured to mechanically interlock adjacent stop elements and transmit forces between adjacent stop elements when the stop elements engage fixed stops on two parts extending from and rotating about a common axis of rotation, such that the individual stop elements essentially behave as a single coherent stop element. The Weglarz does not overcome the shortcomings of Iwai et al. For example, Weglarz does not suggest two robot parts that extend from and rotate about a common axis. Such an arrangement has a number of associated problems that are discussed in the present specification.

In view of the above, the references relied upon in the office action, whether considered alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest patentable features of the claimed invention. Therefore, the references relied upon in the office action, whether considered alone or in combination, do not anticipate the claimed invention or make the claimed invention obvious. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections based upon the cited references.

In conclusion, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this case and early issuance of the Notice of Allowance.

If an interview would advance the prosecution of this case, Applicants urge the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The undersigned authorizes the Commissioner to charge fee insufficiency and credit overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 22-0261.

Dated: June 4, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Eric J. Franklin/  
Eric J. Franklin

Registration No.: 37,134  
VENABLE LLP  
P.O. Box 34385  
Washington, DC 20043-9998  
(202) 344-4000  
(202) 344-8300 (Fax)  
Attorney/Agent For Applicant